wanted Government to pass rules on the executive side ignoring *mamul* but based upon actual judicial decisions.

Reply of Government.—It is not possible to lay down any hard and fast rules as suggested.

REVENUE.

(Nos. 58 to 93.)

SUBJECT No. 58.

Legal practitioners to appear in Revenue Courts.

(*a*) Messrs. B. Venkatasamanna, Chitaldrug municipality, S. Venkatesaiya, Hassan District Agricultural and Industrial Association, B. Narasinga Rao, Seringapatam taluk, H. Krishna Sastri, Sri Yadugiri Sadananda Vardhini Sabha, Melkote, and S. R. Balakrishna Rao, Shimoga municipality.
(*b*) Mr. C. Krishnamurti, Law Association, Bangalore.

Summary of discussion.—(*a*) In view of the general ignorance of the raiyats, it is desirable that parties in revenue cases should be given reasonable facilities to make their representations through counsel. All that has to be said has been said last year (*vide* Subject No. 85 of 1912) and the decision of Government may be kindly made known.

(*b*) The chapter of Civil Procedure Code relating to pleaders and recognized agents may be introduced into the Land Revenue Code.

Mr. Balakrishna Rao of Shimoga.—In Bombay pleaders are allowed to appear in the courts of the Revenue Commissioner though there is no express provision in the rules to this effect. It has been a long established practice, and it has also been so in Mysore till recently. Lawyers should be allowed to appear as a matter of right, and not by sufferance. It is in the interests of the people and not of the pleaders that the right is asked for.

Mr. C. Krishnamurti.—The Revenue Code allows authorized agents to appear in revenue cases. Pleaders are such agents and their appearance should not be objected to.

The Revenue Commissioner pointed out that there were certain cases taken out of the jurisdiction of civil courts, and enquired whether they would be satisfied if pleaders were allowed to appear only in such cases and in suits regarding village offices.

Mr. C. Krishnamurti.—In revenue courts there are no suits. All are 'proceedings' of the courts and pleaders should have the right to appear in all cases,—as agents, if not as pleaders.

It was pointed out that the Board of Revenue in Madras refused to allow pleaders to appear in appeals before them, and that in Bombay also the pleaders had no such recognized right.

Mr. B. Venkatasamanna.—Even if that is so, there is no necessity that we should follow the practice in Madras and Bombay in this respect.

Reply of Government.—The subject is under consideration. Early decision will be communicated.

SUBJECT No. 59.

Disposal of revenue petitions.

Messrs. Ramaswamiengar, Hassan taluk, and Dande Kesavachar and Kesavadasaiengar, Belur taluk.

Summary of discussion.—Having regard to the delay in the disposal of revenue petitions, the multifarious nature of the work of Amildars, and the paucity of hands in the taluk establishments, it is respectfully submitted that the Amildars may be relieved of their extra work in the judicial department, the taluk establishment may be augmented and the shekdar be given a gumasta to help him in the clerical work.

Reply of Government.—This is not considered necessary.

SUBJECT No. 60.

Pay and status of Amildars.

Mr. B. Venkatasamanna, Chitaldrug municipality.

Summary of discussion.—The scale of pay of Amildars may be revised so as to be in conformity with the revised scale of pay of Munsiffs.

Reply of Government.—Noted.

SUBJECT No. 61.

"Malki" sales.

Mr. T. Narasimha Iyengar, Kadur taluk.

Summary of discussion.—Amildars may be empowered to confirm "Malki" sales of lands up to Rs. 100.

Reply of Government.—Will be enquired into.

SUBJECT No. 62.

Sale of building sites.

Mr. T. Narasimha Iyengar, Kadur taluk.

Summary of discussion.—Amildars may be empowered to confirm sales of building sites up to Rs. 25.

Reply of Government.—Will be enquired into.

SUBJECT No. 63.

Pay of Taluk Sheristadars.

Mr. Garudachar, Channapatna municipality.

Summary of discussion.—It is prayed that the pay of Taluk Sheristadars may be raised and fixed at three grades of Rs. 50-5-60, Rs. 60-5-70, and Rs. 70-5-80, so as to make them eligible for Amildari under the rules in force.

Reply of Government.—The pay of Sheristadars has been recently increased.

SUBJECT No. 64.

Shekdari service.

Mr. Garudachar, Channapatna municipality.

Summary of discussion.—It is prayed that the designation of Shekdars be changed into Revenue Inspectors and their pay raised to suit their present responsibilities so as to attract better men to the service.

Reply of Government.—This is not considered necessary.

SUBJECT No. 65.

Remuneration to shanbhogs and patels.

Messrs. Subba Rao, Turuvekere sub-taluk, Kodandaramasetti and Channabasaviah, Tumkur taluk, Naraharaiya, Rudrappa, and Krishna Rao, Nelamangala taluk, Muninagegowda and S. Hanumantha Rao, Devanhalli taluk, S. Ramanna, Hassan municipality, Chik Subba Rao, Hunsur taluk; H. Venkatasubbiah, Krishnarajpete taluk; Chik Mallappa, Gundlupet taluk; and Kalegowda, Yedatore taluk.

Withdrawn.